

## Office of the Attorney General State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 1997

Ms. Tamara Armstrong Assistant County Attorney Travis County P.O. Box 1748 Austin, Texas 78767

OR97-2800

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 111440.

The Travis County Supervision and Corrections Department (the "department") received a request for 1) the current Operations and Management Agreement between the department and the Correctional Services Corporation ("CSC"), and 2) the proposal CSC submitted. You have released information responsive to item 1 and some of the information responsive to item 2. However, you claim that some portions of the requested proposal is excepted from public disclosure by section 552.110 of the Government Code. You have submitted the information at issue to this office for review.

Since the property and privacy rights of a third party are implicated by the release of the requested information here, this office notified CSC of the request. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

CSC raises section 552.110 as an exception to disclosure of the requested information. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of "trade secret" from the Restatement of Torts, section 757, which holds a "trade secret" to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the "trade secrets" branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a prima facie case for exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) at 5.1

In Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996), this office announced that it would follow the federal courts' interpretation of exemption 4 to the federal Freedom of Information Act when applying the second prong of section 552.110 for commercial and financial information. In National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974), the court concluded that for information to be excepted under exemption 4 to the Freedom of Information Act, disclosure of the requested information must be likely either to (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future, or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained. National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). A business enterprise cannot succeed in a National Parks claim by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996) at 4. To prove substantial competitive harm, the party seeking to prevent disclosure must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure. Id.

The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: "(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS, § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982) at 2, 306 (1982) at 2, 255 (1980) at 2.

CSC argues that disclosure of its cost specifications, found in section II.C.4.c, "would likely cause substantial harm to CSC's competitive position as it would allow competitors to estimate and under cut future CSC bids." We do not believe that CSC has established that its cost specifications are either a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information that must be withheld. We note that federal cases applying the analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption to prices in awarded government contracts have denied protection for cost and pricing information, reasoning that disclosure of prices charged the government is a cost of doing business with the government. See generally Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview (1995) 151-152. Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. See Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). Consequently, the department may not withhold this information from public disclosure based on the commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982) (pricing proposals may only be withheld under the predecessor to section 552.110 during the bid submission process).

Next, CSC contends that the information contained in sections II.C.4.d, e, and g is technical in nature and that disclosure of the information would give its competitors an unfair advantage. After reviewing CSC's arguments and the information its seeks to withhold, we conclude that CSC has not shown that the information is information that is protected as a trade secret under section 552.110. Accordingly, you must release the submitted information to the requestor.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,

Jin De de

Yen-Ha Le

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

YHL/rho

Ref: ID# 111440

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Glenn T. Heckmann
Director of Business Development
Tyson Management Group
3007 N. Lamar
Austin, Texas 78705
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Debra Dawn General Counsel Correctional Services Corporation 1819 Main Street, Suite 1000 Sarasota, Florida 34236 (w/o enclosures)